

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-8. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-18, 23 and 27 have been amended herein to emphasize novel aspects of the subject invention. These amendments merely clarify the claimed invention and do not alter the scope of the claims, and thus, do not raise new issues requiring further search or undue effort by the Examiner, and therefore entry and consideration thereof is respectfully requested. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 18, and 23-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8, 18, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renaud *et al.* (US 5,958,051) in view of Buxton (US 6,182,279). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Renaud *et al.* nor Buxton, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, *to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings*. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, *the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

Independent claim 1 recites *providing the manifest with a hash of the contents of at least one module of the list of modules*. Independent claim 18 recites an assembly

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

including *a manifest that contains ... a hash of the contents of at least one module of the list of modules*. Additionally, independent claim 23 recites a second component that provides the *manifest with a hash of at least one module of the list of modules*. Renaud *et al.* and Buxton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such aspects of the subject claims.

Renaud *et al.* does not teach or suggest a manifest with a hash of the contents of at least one module as claimed. The Final Office Action dated July 15, 2004 notes that "Renaud does not specify that the hash of the list of modules making up assembly is a hash of the contents of at least one module." (See Final Office Action, pg. 3). Renaud *et al.* discloses a signature file that includes identifiers to data files. (See col. 6, ln. 53-57). The identifiers can be a one-way hash function of a file name. (See col. 7, ln. 15-27). Assuming *arguendo* that the signature file is a manifest and that the data files are modules, Renaud *et al.* fails to teach or suggest that the signature file contains a hash of the contents of at least one data file.

Furthermore, Buxton fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of the Renaud *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 18, and 23. Buxton discloses a component system in which base applications (e.g., components) can be customized by the user in which customizations (e.g., differences in the base applications) are distributed to another user in the form of templates allowing interaction with the same base applications. (See col. 2, ln. 18-28). Buxton discloses that a digital signature can be appended to component contents and that the digital signature can be a hash of the component contents. (See col. 9, ln. 18-25). Assuming *arguendo* that the component is a module, the module contains a hash of its own contents. Thus, Buxton does not teach or suggest that the manifest contains a hash of the contents of at least one module.

Moreover, Renaud *et al.* and Buxton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest identify[ing] whether a runtime version of the at least one module is the same as a version utilized at build time of the assembly as recited in independent claim 1. Additionally, independent claim 18 recites the hash is utilized to control which versions of the modules are employed in connection with the assembly at runtime and independent claim 23 recites that the hash is compared with a hash of the at least one module generated at runtime to identify changes in the content of the at least one module.

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

Renaud *et al.* is related to securing and verifying the authenticity of data being processed on a computer system, and does not relate to determining which version of a module is employed in connection with an assembly. (See col. 1, ln. 14-18). Additionally, Buxton is related to a template builder and does not relate to controlling runtime versions of modules employed in connection with an assembly. (See abstract). Therefore, such aspects of the applicants' claimed invention are not taught or suggested by Renaud *et al.* and Buxton alone or in combination.

In view of at least the foregoing, Renaud *et al.* and Buxton, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest the subject invention as recited in claims 1, 18, and 23 (and claims 2-8, 24, and 25 which respectively depend there from). Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 10-13, and 27-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10-13, and 27-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Renaud *et al.* (US 5,958,051) in view of Evans *et al.* (US 5,805,899). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Renaud *et al.* nor Evans *et al.* alone or in combination teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention.

In particular, Renaud *et al.* and Evans *et al.* do not teach or suggest providing the *manifest with a hash of a manifest of at least one referenced assembly of the list of referenced assemblies* as recited in independent claim 10, a second component that provides *the manifest with a hash of the manifest of the at least one referenced assembly* as recited in independent claim 27, or providing *the manifest with a hash of the manifest of the at least one related assembly* as recited in independent claim 30.

The Office Action concedes that Renaud *et al.* does not "disclose a manifest with a hash of a manifest of one referenced assembly of the list of referenced assemblies." (See Final Office Action dated July 15, 2004, pg. 10). The Office Action contends "Renaud teaches representing a manifest with a hashed representation (signature 322 – Fig. 3B)." (See Final Office Action dated July 15, 2004, pg. 10). However, the hashed representation (*e.g.*, signature) is not a hash of a manifest. Thus, Renaud *et al.* does not

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

teach or suggest that the manifest is provided with a hash of a manifest of the at least one referenced assembly as claimed.

Additionally, Evans *et al.* fails to make up for the deficiencies of Renaud *et al.* Evans *et al.* relates to providing versioning information for a plurality of software objects. (See abstract). More particularly, Evans *et al.* utilizes a hash value that is generated from the name of a version using a conventional ELF hashing function. (See col. 11, ln. 46-48). The Office Action asserts that "Evans discloses pointer means to refer to other manifest of other assemblies that the pointing assembly depends on." (See Final Office Action dated July 15, 2004, pg. 11). However, Evans *et al.* does not teach or suggest hashing a manifest of a referenced assembly.

In view of at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Renaud *et al.* and Evans *et al.* do not make obvious applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 10, 27, and 30, and dependent claims 11-13, 28-29, 31-35 which respectively depend therefrom. This rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 14-17, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14-17, and 22 syand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Renaud *et al.* (US 5,958,051) and Evans *et al.* (US 5,805,899) as applied to claims 10 and 16 (for 14-17) and further in view of Buxton (US 6,182,279). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Renaud *et al.*, Evans *et al.* nor Buxton teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention alone or in combination of one another.

More particularly, independent claim 22 recites *a manifest that contains ... a hash of the contents of a manifest of the at least one referenced assembly*. As noted *supra*, Renaud *et al.* and Evans *et al.* fail to teach or suggest hashing the contents of a manifest of the at least one referenced assembly as recited in the applicants' claimed invention. Moreover, Buxton does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Renaud *et al.* and Evans *et al.* Buxton is silent regarding hashing the contents of a manifest of the at least one referenced assembly.

Moreover, Buxton does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Renaud *et al.* and Evans *et al.* with respect to independent claim 10 (from which claims

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

14-17 depend). In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Renaud *et al.*, Evans *et al.* and Buxton do not make obvious applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 10 and 22, and dependent claims 14-17 which depend from claim 10. This rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 9, 19-21, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9, 19-21, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Renaud *et al.* (US 5,958,051) and Buxton (US 6,182,279) as applied to claim 1, 18, 23, and further in view of Evans *et al.* (US 5,805,899). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Renaud *et al.*, Evans *et al.* nor Buxton teach or suggest the applicants' claimed invention alone or in combination of one another.

Claims 9, 19-21, and 26 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, 18, and 23. As noted *supra*, the cited references do not teach or suggest applicants' invention recited in the subject claims, and therefore do not make obvious the applicants' claimed invention. Evans *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Renaud *et al.* and Buxton with respect to independent claims 1, 18, and 23. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731